ORIGINAL

Steven J. Nataupsky (State Bar No. 155,913)
snataupsky@kmob.com
Boris Zelkind (State Bar No. 214,014)
boris.zelkind@kmob.com
Ali S. Razai (State Bar No. 246,922)
ali.razai@kmob.com
KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP
550 West C Street, Suite 1200
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 235-8550
Facsimile: (619) 235-0176

Attorneys for Plaintiff
I-FLOW CORPORATION

FILED

08 JAN 10 PM 2:14

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BY: PDL DEPUTY

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

I-FLOW CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation, Plaintiff, v. ZONE MEDICAL, LLC, a California limited liability company, Defendant.	Civil Action No. '08 CV 0057 JAH WMc **NOTICE OF RELATED CASES**

CR

Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 40.1(e), Plaintiff, I-FLOW CORPORATION ("I-FLOW") hereby gives notice of the following related currently-pending case that was previously filed by I-FLOW in the Southern District of California:

I-Flow Corp. v. Apex Medical and Mark McGlothlin, Case No. 07-cv-1200 DMS (NLS), filed June 29, 2007.

As the above-listed cases and the present case involve I-FLOW's U.S. Patent No. 5,284,481, entitled "Compact Collapsible Infusion Apparatus," and the same accused infringing instrumentality, assignment of this case to a single district judge is likely to effect a saving of judicial effort and other economies.

Further pursuant to Local Civil Rule 40.1(e), Plaintiff, I-FLOW CORPORATION ("I-FLOW") hereby gives notice of the following related previously-pending cases that were previously filed by I-FLOW in the Central District of California:

1. *I-Flow Corp., et al. v. Winters, et al.*, Case No. 01-cv-00292 DOC(AN), filed March 8, 2001; and
2. *I-Flow Corp. v. Novacon Corp.*, Case No. 99-cv-00962 AHS (EE), filed July 23, 1999.

While each of the above-listed cases and the present case involve I-FLOW's U.S. Patent No. 5,284,481, entitled "Compact Collapsible Infusion Apparatus," assignment of this case to a single district judge is not likely to effect a saving of judicial effort or other economies because each of the above listed cases were assigned to different district judges and were resolved without a decision on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: January 10, 2008

By: ______________________

Steven J. Nataupsky
Boris Zelkind
Ali S. Razai

Attorneys for Plaintiff
I-FLOW CORPORATION